1:Vaillant A-5 (1928-1936)1941 NU7 Aztec NU7

a hook at the farther end, the nearer end being grasped in the hand. By lengthening the arm in this way it was possible to give a greater propulsive force to the spear.

On the other side of the plaza the boys in the religious-training school presented a less animated scene. Their little legs and faces lacerated by maguey spines, their bodies thin from fasts and penance and their eyes dulled by the monotony of self-denial, these children were chanting strophes from a ritualistic chant. Their preceptor, who led the singing, showed by his own scarred and emaciated body that the propitiation of the gods was a relentless and never-ending task. Priest, chief, warrior or husband, every Aztec, from boyhood on, spent much of his life either in a kind of beseeching penance, to ensure his future, or in a state of grateful atonement for not having had a worst past. The Aztecs lived on intimate if uncomfortable terms with the supernatural powers.

Another aspect of this lack of individualism was to be seen in the *tecpan* or clan building. Here elders of the clan were arranging the affairs of the tribal unit, twenty of which made up the city-state of Tenochtitlan. One old man peered over picture maps as he adjusted a question of land tenure between two contesting families and made his final judgment on the basis of how much land each family could cultivate by its own efforts. Another elder distributed pottery vessels, given up as tribute by a town across the mountains, to some of the poorer members of the community. None of these people, litigants or applicants, bestowed more than occasional glances into the back courtyard, where an adulterer was being stoned to death by members of the affronted family. Urban existence contained too many interests and

1:Vaillant A-5 (1928-1936)1941 NU7 Aztec NU7

174 life was too cheap for them to view as an excitement the [184] inevitable result of wrongdoing.

518 Each of the twenty tribal divisions regulated its own 648 affairs. The great plaza where Montezuma had his palace 174 and where all the gods were worshiped in many temples was 631 for the use of all the clans together; and was the civic center for the sixty thousand households of Tenochtitlan. Yet in spite of the importance of this center of religion and government, the great plaza of Tlaltelolco near the northern edge of the islands was almost as striking. Once a Mexican tribe acknowledged the sway of another power it was supposed to furnish fighting men and tribute, but its government and economics were seldom modified.

174 Thus the recently conquered Tlaltelolco had a communal 361 center as majestic as that of Tenochtitlan. It seemed more dramatic to Spanish eyes because its great temple to the War God, Huitzilopochtli, was thrust into prominence by the wide spread of the market place, while in Tenochtitlan the great buildings were so close together it was hard to gain an impression of their size.

174 The market place of Tlaltelolco consisted of a large area [361] of polished pavement, bordered by arcades which sheltered 438 many of the merchants. At one edge a basin opened out from the canal beside the northern causeway, where boats bringing goods and produce could find an anchorage. Each kind of product was concentrated in a special place. Thus one section was completely devoted to vegetables, and compactly squatting women sat watching their goods, arranged before them in symmetrical heaps on woven mats. In another section cotton mantles were being sold, some spread to show the full design and others neatly folded. Elsewhere was a

8: Barlow E-4 (no date)1949 NU7 Aztec NU7

V. THE OLD ACOLHUA DOMAIN: THE SOUTHWEST

631 648 175

THERE IS a variety of evidence for ascribing a principal role to the Acolhuaque in the parts of Morelos and Guerrero we are about to examine. A list of towns paying tribute to Texcoco[1] names nine towns of the Cuernavaca area—a situation fully confirmed by Ixtlilxochitl, who relates the invasion of this region by Empire troops and adds, "cupieron á Nezahualcoyotzin con la cabecera de Quauhnahuac nueve pueblos."[2] (Some of these nine pueblos are in Quauhnahuac Province; others, however, are in adjacent Huaxtepec.) Ixtlilxochitl also tells how Nezahualcoyotl overran Tlalcoçauhtitlan and placed a governor over it.[3]

[128]

To the nucleus of three provinces (Quauhnahuac, Huaxtepec, and Tlalcoçauhtitlan) which the Acolhuaque certainly dominated, two others have been added (Chalco and Quiauhteopan). Their inclusion in this section is based on inference, a wish to maintain symmetry, the need of avoiding too many subdivisions, and the absence of conflicting evidence. It may be a great indiscretion.

21. CHALCO

SOURCES OF THE MAP

635 114

On the nineteenth page of the *Matricula* and folio 41' of the *Codex Mendocino* appears the province of Chalco, containing six principal towns, which lay in the south of the Valley of Mexico and reached down to the Valley of Morelos. Chalco is a province which presents several problems. Documents are curiously lacking, despite the great pre-Hispanic importance of the province. There is no sixteenth-century relación, for example, and maps of today are not very useful, but on the 1927 map of the "Estado de México" three of the towns have been identified, as follows:

[128]

MENDOCINO	1927 MAP
Chalco, 1	Tlalmanalco
Quauhxumulco, 2	Cuajomulco
Tepuztlan, 3	Tepoztlan

[103]

[1] Lehmann, vs. 1343.
[2] Ixtlilxochitl, *Obras históricas* (1892), II: 196.
[3] Quoted in n. 36 below.

565 These levels did not have an absolute castelike rigidity. Besides what we have already seen regarding the fact that some macehuales were in a special position by reason of their exploits in life and not by birth, and that there were lords who lost their privileged situation of tribute receiving, we know that it was customary for pillis and [582] macehuales (42) to intermarry, the children of which marriages must

42. Motolinía, Memorials [Memoriales], p. 123; Zumárraga, p. 66, etc.

have had a different position from those children of marriages between pillis or of pure macehuales. There must have been present a whole series of people, from the most noble to the most plebian, we could say (using the terms noble and plebian in our sense), giving rise to a real pyramid of levels within the Tenochca group. Thus we see that the differentiation of rank had a corresponding economic differentiation; but that this latter had a limitation: not all the pillis could be recipients of tribute, but only the functionaries of the tribe or of the calpulli, and on the other hand, not all the macehuales payed tribute, those valiant in war being excepted. In their recognition of this stratification Caso, Spinden (43), Toscano, Moreno, White, etc. are

43. Spinden, H.J., 1943, p. 210.

right, but only in part, since these strata were not social classes; they could be considered ranks because of the little mobility of those belonging to them, generally by birth (an affirmation which with respect to the uppermost level can be definitive); but—and this is the fundamental thing—it can be shown that the existance of these strata was hinged to that of ambilateral stratified clans, the calpullis, and that it was therefore not a fundamental structure but a derived one, as will be seen in the second part of this work.

/p. 31/ Chapter 3

TERRITORIAL DIVISION

[631] Another of the aspects of the social organization of Tenochtitlan which has led us to think that it was not based on kinship through

●631 common descent is the existence of what the Spanish called "barrios" [henceforth "wards"], or territorial divisions of Tenochtitlan. This chapter attempts to describe all the elements which were related to the calpullis in the whole of the territorial organization, and not really to make a reconstruction of a topographical type (1). If we

1. Topographically, the work of Toussalent Fernández and Gómez de Orozco on Tenochtitlan is very complete. But it does not touch upon the problem which interests us here (Plans of Mexico City: the 16th and 17th Centuries [Planos de la Ciudad de México. Siglos XVI y XVII] Mexico, 1938).

analyze the data which we find relevant to this in the sources, we see that it very amply clarifies for us the situation extant around the time of the arrival of the Spanish, and which we can synthesize in the following form: the Altepetl Tenochtitlan was formed of four Campan ("large wards"), each of these by various Calpulli ("wards"), each formed by various Chinampa (family plots).

This table results from examining the most significant data in the sources refering to the Territorial division of Tenochtitlan. We do not know what the situation was before the arrival and establishment of the Tenochcas on the island, but we are told that upon establishing themselves on Tenochtitlan the leaders split up among four wards "each one with his relatives and associates, where each party built at will" (2), according to which it appears that the members of each

2. Ramírez Codex [Códice Ramírez], p. 42.

one of the four aforesaid wards were more closely associated with each other than with the other members of the Tenochca group. Also, the Nahuatl text—which clarifies the Spanish text—which describes the same happening, gives the term /p. 32/ calpulli (Nahuatl: "large house") as corresponding to "plots" while it uses nauhcampan (Nahuatl: "four regions") to designate the four wards (3). According to this it

3. Tezozomoc, Mexicayotl, p. 37.

●631 appears that upon the Tenochcas' establishing themselves on the island they divided it into four parts (campan) in each one of which only calpullis allied to each other were established.

This came about at the time of settling in Tenochtitlan. What was the situation by the time of the arrival of the Spanish? On one hand the calpullis still occupied the lands that were "divided up when they came to the land and each family or band settled in the lots which were assigned to them and their descendants" (4). That is, by

4. Zurita, p. 25.

the time of the arrival of the Spanish the calpullis still had the same distribution as when they were established. What is more, well into Colonial times, Mexico City was divided into four large wards, each one containing other smaller ones (5). Surely the large wards were

5. Torquemada, I, p. 294.

remains of the groups of allied calpullis (the campans) and the smaller wards must have been remains of the calpullis, both affected by the conquest, but whose importance must have been very strong since even then, as before, these wards (large and small) had leaders [mandones] "in common as well as in particular" (6).

6. Torquemada, I, p. 294.

Let us turn now to the matter of the divisions of the calpullis: an author tells us that what was called calpulli before the conquest, afterwards was called tlaxilacalli (7). Although this may have

7. The datum possibly is Motolinía's, but unfortunately I have lost the exact reference, and although I have tried to find the datum, I have not succeeded.

happened in a few cases, it appears that for Tenochtitlan the matter was not so simple. Above all we have the information that in the Colonial period, besides the division of Tenochtitlan in four large wards, and of these into calpullis, each calpulli "was divided into streets which they called tlaxilacalles" [sic] (8). Thus it is that

8. Torquemada, II, p. 545.

631 tlaxilacallis and calpullis were not the same, but that tlaxilacalli was at least a subdivision of the territory of the calpullis, if it is not that they were aggregates based on kinship through descent as some documents suggest which tell us of married couples founding tlaxilacallis in places near Mexico (9), and the affirmation that the

9. Cuajimalpa Codex [Códice Cuajimalpa]

tlaxilacallis of Tenochtitlan defended with great diligence the integrity of their lands (10), as if they belonged to closed groups of rela-

10. Torquemada, II, p. 545.

tives.

/p. 33/ It could be thought that about the time of the arrival of the Spanish the tlaxilacallis were families or family lots of the calpulli; but against this possibility we have forceful arguments: they are called "wards" and "streets"; besides it is certain that there happened in Mexico what happened in other nearby places, in which each calpulli was subdivided into two or three tlaxilacallis (11), a

11. Chimalpain, Ms. Silvia Rendón. 6a. Relation [Relación], p. 231.

number of families which appears very small to form a calpulli. And in the "Maguey Paper Plan" [Plano de Papel de Maguey] appear the "streets" mentioned by Torquemada—the tlaxilacallis—separated from one another by water and earth, and each one of them has subdivisions which certainly were the family plots. The tlaxilacallis thus appear larger than the family or the family territory, and smaller than a calpulli or the territory of the calpulli.

On the other hand, we fortunately have many data which clarify the concrete picture of the tlaxilacallis in Tenochtitlan: the Description of the Archbishopric of Mexico [Descripción del Arzobispado de México] tells us that the tlaxilacallis were like "small wards" (12) and that in St. Pablo—corresponding to the

12. Description of the Archbishopric [Descripción del Arzobispado], p. 278.

631 Teopan campan (13) or Teopan Xuchititlan (14)—there were twelve

13. Vetancourt, III, p. 124.

14. Chimalpain, Diary [Diario], p. 275.

tlaxilacallis and five small properties besides Iztacalco which used to be part of St. Pablo only occasionally. Examining the list of "wards" of the Ms. 13994 (15), eleven "wards" are obtained (see the

15. In Royal Decrees and Other Papers regarding the Indies [Cédulas Reales y otros papeles tocantes a las Indias].

Table of tlaxilacallis): certainly these "wards" of the said manuscript are tlaxilacallis. This explains to us much of the territorial affairs of Tenochtitlan: one of the names of the tlaxilacallis which appear in the aforesaid manuscript is the same as one from the list of wards in the table of correspondence between wards and the social division of work (Tzapotlan, that of the vendors of uxitl of St. Juan). Another of the tlaxilacalli names, Huitznahuatonco (of St. Pablo), certainly is not the Huitznahuac of the lords and fishermen mentioned by Sahagun (see p. 50), since the tlaxilacalli Tecpantitlan (which means 'place of the palace') must have been the one which corresponded to the lords of St. Juan. It well could be that the tlaxilacalli Tecpantitlan had another name, non-descriptive, and that this is one of the three which appear in the list: Yopico, which is the only one exclusively associated with the lords; another could have been that of a calpulli to which the tlaxilacalli Tecpancaltitlan belonged. Unfortunately, with the data at hand, we are unable to make other correlations between tlaxilacallis and calpullis. Nevertheless we can shed a good deal of light: there was a single tlaxilacalli in which was the women's temple (Cihuateocaltitlan), in the Moyotla campan (St. Juan). But there were four tlaxilacallis called Teocaltitlan, one in each campan which surely corresponded to the locations /p. 34/ of the temples, the Teocallis. Then again, all this causes us to catch a glimpse of a difference in the category of the tlaxilacallis within the calpullis and within all Tenochtitlan as a whole. Although the data refer to an already post-Hispanic epoch, undoubtedly the situation which they suggest has many marked aspects of the pre-Hispanic.

63 There are other terms than campan, calpulli, and tlaxilacalli which we should clear up, and whose importance in understanding the situation of the Tenochcas is fundamental: altepetl was translated by town and huey altepetl for Provincial Capital. Huey altepetl means large altepetl and was applied to such places as Tenochtitlan with many calpullis and with political hegemony over other groups; it could well be that altepetl was applied to places without hegemony over other groups. One author tells us that altepetlalli (lands of the altepetl) and calpullalli (lands of the calpulli) were the same (16).

16. Ixtlilxóchitl, II, p. 170.

In support of this Clavigero tells us that the lands of the altepetlalli were divided in as many parts as there were wards (17), thus the re-

17. Clavigero, I, p. 355.

lationship between altepetlalli and altepetl, and between calpullalli and calpulli is explained: the altepetl was made up of calpullis, and the whole of the lands of the calpullis constituted the land of the town (18).

18. There are other terms whose definition would be very useful; but I have no information sufficient to do it: tlayacapan, which Molina translates in his dictionary as ward and as collation; calnacazco, which he translates as district [cantón]; tepepa, which he translates as city, as he does altepetl; and chinampa, which he translates as ward, although its present usage in Mexico is closer in meaning to family plot.

It appears that the discussed terms were vague in meaning under certain conditions, which allows one to believe that through a natural process of growth, theoretically at least, the family territory could come to be that of a tlaxilacalli, that of a calpulli, (and, though perhaps not, that of an altepetl); the calpulli, "large house" nevertheless remaining as the basic unit.

Thus we find the territorial organization of Tenochtitlan as we presented it at the beginning of this chapter: altepetl, campan, calpulli, tlaxilacalli, and chinampa as subdivisions, in descending

631 order, of the territory of the group. This subdivision could have been a simply territorial subdivision: in wards; but it appears more likely to have some relationship with kinship phenomena, through the mentioning of tlaxilacallis as founded by married couples and campan formed by allied calpullis. These relationships will be absolutely certain if it is demonstrated that the calpulli was a clan, and there certainly are arguments which could lead one to believe that among the Tenochcas the calpullis were clans, as will be seen in the Second Part.

/p. 35/ TABLE OF THE TLAXILACALLIS OF TENOCHTITLAN IN 1637 (1)

631
103

1. There are mentioned in the list the tlaxilacallis which appear in the report of the year of 1637 of Ms. 13994, and in the notes are recorded the differences with respect to the report of the previous year—which is less complete—and some mention of various tlaxilacallis made by Chimalpain in his Diary (which information was sent me by Mr. R. H. Barlow). Naturally the names of the calpullis do not generally coincide with those of tlaxilacallis. [Further footnotes in this table are not interlineated, but appear at the end of the section. —translator.]

The large ward of St. Juan (2) or Moyotla.	The large ward of St. Pablo or Zoquiapan (3).	The large ward of St. Sebastián or Atzacoalco.	The large ward of St. María or Cuepopan.
Tecpancaltitlan (4)			
Cihuateocaltitlan			
Teocaltitlan	Teocaltitlan	Teocaltitlan	Teocaltitlan
Tzapotla	Tlachcuitlan (11)	Tomatla (12)	Tlacolpan (15)
Macpalxochititlan	Ateponazco	Coatlan	Tezcaltzonco
Tequicaltitlan	Toltinco	Zacatlan (13)	Analpa
Huehuecalco (5)	Huitznahuatonco	Cuitlahuatonco (14)	Copolco
Atlampa (6)			Atlampa
St. Critóbal	Tozcamincan	Cotolco	Colhuacayonco
Hueyaztacalco	Temazcaltitlan		Iztacalecan
Tlalcocomoco	Ometochtitlan		
Amanalco	Contzinco		
Petitlan (7)	Zoquipan		
Aticapan	Ocelotzontecontitlan		
Tlatilco			
Xihuitonco			
Tequixquipan (8)			
Necaltitlan			
Xollohco (9)			
Acatla			
Xacalpan (10)			

9:Monzon--33 E-4 (no date) 1949 NU7 Aztec NU7

103

•631
103

2. The names of these "wards" were considered by Vetancourt as names of the calpullis of all of Tenochtitlan, and Bandelier and many authors followed him in his error.

3. Chimalpain called this "large ward" Teopan Xuchititlan (p. 275, Diary [Diario]).

4. Missing in 1636.

5. Also in Chimalpain, p. 13.

6. Tlapa appears in 1636, which is perhaps a mutilated entry.

7. Tepatitlan appears in 1936 [sic. 1636] which seems more correct.

8. Also in Chimalpain, p. 15.

9. Also Chimalpain, p. 219.

10. Xapalca appears in 1636.

11. Also in Chimalpain, p. 251.

12. Also in Chimalpain, p. 13, where it appears as Tonatla.

13. Missing in 1636.

14. Also in Chimalpain, p. 238.

15. Also in Chimalpain, p. 238.

11:Diaz T,H-5 (1519-1520) 1910
NU7 Aztec NU7

and Montezuma released, and that some of them should proclaim themselves as Kings of Mexico, as I will go on to relate.

CHAPTER C.

How the nephews of the great Montezuma went about assembling the other Lords and persuading them to come to Mexico and free the great Montezuma from his imprisonment and drive us out of the City and kill us.

As Cacamatzin, lord of the City of Texcoco, which after Mexico is the largest and most important city that there is in New Spain, knew that his uncle, Montezuma, had been imprisoned for many days, and that we were taking the upper hand in every way that was possible, and also got to know that we had opened the chamber where the great treasure of his grandfather Axayaca was kept, but had not taken anything from it, he determined, before we could take possession of the treasure, to call together all the Lords of Texcoco, who were his vassals, and the lord of Coyoacan, who was his cousin and Montezuma's nephew, and the lord of Tacuba, and the lord of Iztapalapa, and another great Cacique who was lord of Matalçingo, who was very nearly related to Montezuma and of whom it was even said that he was the rightful heir to the kingdom and lordship of Mexico, and who was a chieftain known among the Indians for his personal bravery. While he [Cacamatzin] continued to negotiate with these and other Mexican chieftains that on a given day they should come with all their forces and attack us, it seems that the Cacique whom I have said was known for his personal bravery (whose name I do not know), said that if he [Cacamatzin] would assure to him the Kingship of Mexico, to which he was the rightful heir, that he and all his relations, and the people of the province called Matalçingo,

11:Diaz T,H-5 (1519-1520) 1910
NU7 Aztec NU7

631 would be the first to take up arms and turn us out of
643 Mexico, or not leave any one of us alive. It appears that
721 Cacamatzin replied that the Chieftainship of Mexico belonged to him and that he himself must be King, for he was the nephew of Montezuma; and that if he [the Lord of Matalçingo] did not wish to come, that they would make war on us without his help or that of his people, for it seems that Cacamatzin had got ready all the Lords and towns already named by me, and had already arranged the day on which they were to fall on Mexico, and that the chieftains of his faction who were then in the city would facilitate their entry.

721 While these negotiations were going on, Montezuma knew all about them from his powerful relation [the lord of Matalçingo] who would not come to an agreement with Cacamatzin, and to be more sure of it, Montezuma sent to summon all the Caciques and chieftains of that City [Texcoco], and they told him how Cacamatzin was going about persuading them all with words and gifts to join him in an attack on us, and to free his uncle. As Montezuma was prudent and did not wish to see his city rise up in arms or riots, he told Cortés what was happening. Our Captain and all of us soldiers knew a good deal about this disturbance, but not so fully as Montezuma now detailed it. The advice that Cortés now gave him was that he should give us his Mexican followers and we would fall on Texcoco and capture or destroy that city and its neighbourhood. As that advice did not suit Montezuma, Cortés sent to tell Cacamatzin that he should cease his preparations for war, which would be the means of his destruction, for he wished to have him as a friend, and that all that he could do for him personally he would do, and many other compliments. Now Cacamatzin was a young man who found many others, who shared his opinions, ready to support him in the war, so he sent to tell Cortés,

14:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

pan, we shall not attempt to discuss here, reserving it for a future opportunity;[147] it is sufficient to establish that all those tribes, whether regarded by history, as it now appears, as confederated or allied to the Mexicans, or as their subjects, *were at any rate under the military supremacy of Mexico.*[148] Whenever, therefore, from any cause whatever, the Mexican chief-council agreed upon war, delegates were sent to all tribes connected with Mexico,[149] calling upon them to send their forces, with supplies and ammunition, to a certain place where the Mexicans would meet them, and whence all together would proceed, under Mexican command, on the foray determined upon by the tribe of the lake-centre.[150]

726 648

Such notifications were never disregarded by the valley-pueblos,[151] still less by those of different stock-languages outside of the valley, and held by the Mexicans as tributary subjects.[152] The force,

[147] It is not to our purpose to determine here whether a league or confederacy existed between Mexico, Tezcuco, and Tlacopan, or whether the latter two tribes were subjects of the former. There is a great deal of contradiction among the authors on the subject, and we intend, if possible, to make it the subject of a future discussion.

[148] Herrera (Dec. III, lib. IV, cap. XV, p. 133): "Con Mexico estaban confederados "los Señores de Tezcuco, i Tlacopan, que hora llaman Tacuba, i partian lo que gana- "ban, i obedecian al Señor de Mexico, en lo tocante à la guerra." This is also confirmed by the fact that, when Cortés moved towards Mexico from the coast, he was everywhere told of the great power of the *Mexicans only*, without any reference to the others. On a joint expedition or foray, the Mexican chief commanded the others, even if he was inferior in rank to the "Tlacatecuhtli." (Zurita, p. 11). [554]

[149] This fact is so numerously mentioned by Tezozomoc, that we forbear encumbering with detailed quotations. Almost every other chapter of the Cronica Mexicana, after the 20th about, has a reference to it. Also Durán.

[150] When the Mexicans sallied forth on their unlucky expedition against Mechoacan, in 1479, all the tribes were directed to meet at "Matlatzinco-Toluca" (Tezozomoc, cap. LI, p. 83). Durán (Cap. XXXVII, p. 286). Axayacatl: "mandó partiese el exercito de "la ciudad y que en sus capitanias fuesen à los términos de los Matlatzincas, y que alli "se hiciese junta de la gente entre estos terminos de Matlatzinco y Tlaximaloyan." On the foray against "Xiquipilco y Xilotepec,"—Chilocan was appointed meeting-place,—"commenced to move the Mexicans, all the others having set out already two or three "days before, for the same place of Chilocan" (Tezozomoc, cap. LXI, p. 102). Durán, speaking of the foray against Meztitlan (Cap. XL, p. 313): "El rey, que mientras le tu- "raua la uncion y estar velando salvo sus insinias y en ayuno y penitencia, que toda la "gente que estuviese aperceuida y aparejada se recogiesse en Atotonilco, y que alli "aguardasen todos al demas exercito y en Itzmiquilpan."

[151] There is not a single instance on record that, up to the time the Spaniards arrived, any pueblo had ever ventured to refuse such assistance to the Mexicans. Only when Cortés moved upon Mexico for the second time, did such acts of open rebellion occur.

[152] Some difference existed between the relations of the Mexicans with *kindred* tribes speaking the same ("Nahuatl") language, and with those of other stock. Thus, the "Totonaca" of the coast were held in great subjection, while the Chalca of the valley were treated almost like allies. It is not impossible that the so-called empire of Mexico (or of Anahuac, as it is very erroneously called) may yet prove to have been but a confederacy of the Nahuatlac-tribes of the valley, with the Mexicans as military leaders. [631]

15:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

disastrous for both parties, negotiations commenced, terminating with the formation of a *military confederacy*, under the *leadership* of Mexico.[61]

It appears that in this, as in all other transactions of the same nature, mutual concessions had to be made. Thus, while the Tezcucans conceded the military command to the Mexicans, the latter had to admit into the confederacy that part of the Tecpanecas who, since the destruction of Azcaputzalco, recognized in Tlacopan (Tacuba) their chief pueblo. Through *tezcucan* influence it is even probable that the tribute heretofore paid to the Mexicans by that tribe, was relinquished by the former.[62]

The following seem to have been the leading features of the confederacy.

It consisted of the three tribes of Mexico, Tezcuco and Tlacopan. Each of these tribes was territorially independent; as well as in the management of its own affairs: from the two others.[63]

The military command of the forces belonged to the head-war-

[61] Durán (Cap. XIV, p. 124. Cap. XV, pp. 125–132), mentions a *sham fight* between the Mexicans and Tezcucans, ending in a confederacy. Acosta (Lib. VII, cap. XV, p. 490), confirms. Herrera (Dec. III, lib. II, cap. XIII, p. 64), speaks of a voluntary "submission" by the Tezcucans. Tezozomoc (Cap. XIX and XX), asserts that the Tezcucans were actually conquered by the Mexicans. On the other hand, Ixtlilxochitl ("Hist. des Chichim." Cap. XXXIV). Torquemada (Lib. II, cap. LVII, p. 173). Veytia (Lib. III, cap. V). Bustamante ("Tezcoco" Parte IIa. cap. V), affirm that a fight took place, in which the Mexicans were worsted, and after which the Tezcucan feudal "empire" was firmly established. The truth probably lies between the two extremes, and is recognized as such by Torquemada (Lib. II, cap. LVII, p. 173). Durán (Cap. XIV, p. 124), and finally expressed by Zurita ("Rapport." p. 11), as follows: "The sovereign of Mexico was superior to those of Tacuba and Tezcuco in matters touching warfare; in all others, their powers were equal, so that neither of them meddled with the government of the others." Herrera has adopted this view, copying almost textually (Dec. III, lib. IV, p. 122, of chapter XV).

[62] The only confession found in specifically Mexican authors on the subject of the Tecpanecas of Tlacopan is the quotation from Durán (Cap. XIV, p. 123). But Ixtlilxochitl ("Hist. des Chichim." Cap. XXXII, pp. 219 and 220.) says: "It is plainly visible from this song that the three dynasties named were the principal ones of Mexico, and that the King of Tlacopan was regarded as equal to those of Mexico and Tezcuco.") Torquemada (Lib. II, cap. LVII, p. 173. Cap. XXXIX, p. 141). Veytia (Lib. III, cap. III). Clavigero (Lib. IV, caps. II and III), and Bustamante (Parte IIIa. cap. II, pp. 161, 163 and 163).— All are positive in affirming that the Tezcucans insisted upon having the Tecpanecas as a third member. The Mexican authors not contradicting, and impartial sources, like Zurita and Herrera,— establishing the fact of equality of power, and territorial autonomy (See note 61), we, therefore, feel justified in recognizing the fact as established.

[63] Alonzo de Zurita ("Rapport sur les différentes classes de chefs de la Nouvelle-Espagne," p. 11).

15:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

chief of the Mexican tribe, with power probably to delegate the same.[64]

Each of the three tribes elected its head war-chiefs according to its own customs; but the installation in office, *the investiture*, took place with the concurrence of the head-chiefs of the other tribes. This was especially the case in Mexico, where the "tlacatecuhtli" became commander-in-chief of the confederacy.[65]

Each tribe could carry on its own wars, defensive as well as offensive, independently; but if required, the others had to assist, in which case the Mexicans took the lead.[66]

Consequently, each tribe could have its *own conquests*, and levy its *own tribute* upon tribes which it had conquered *alone*.[67]

But wherever the *confederacy* had subjugated a foreign tribe, the spoils as well as all the subsequent tribute were divided among the three members as follows: Mexico and Tezcuco each two-fifths, and Tlacopan one-fifth.[68]

The establishment of this confederacy did not, in any manner whatever, alter the principles already recognized for the tenure and distribution of the soil. It only shows, and the subsequent career of the confederation further supports it, that these principles were common among the three tribes concerned. Wherever their conquests extended, the conquered were not annexed, but simply subjected to tribute, their territory and tribal autonomy were preserved, and no change introduced in the distribution of the soil beyond the reservation of tracts for the raising of tribute. Stewards, "calpixca," were the only representatives of the confederacy or of any of its members, residing permanently with the

[64] Zurita (p. 11). Herrera (Dec. III, lib. IV, cap. XV, p. 133).

[65] Mendieta (Lib. II. cap. XXXVII. p. 133). Torquemada (Lib. XI, cap. XXVI, p. 332). Durán (Cap. XXXII, p. 235; cap. XXXIX, p. 303; cap. XLI. p. 325; cap. LII, p. 409). Tezozomoc (Cap. XLI, p. 65; cap. LVI, p. 91; caps. LX and LXI, p. 109; cap. LXXXII, pp. 142 and 144). Ixtlilxochitl ("Hist. des Chichim.," Cap. I, pp. 2 and 3; cap. LX, p. 49; cap. LXX, p. 102). See also Veytia,—but especially Clavigero, who is very positive (Lib. IV, cap. III. "Besides, the two Kings (of Tezcuco and Tacuba), were honorary assistants to the election of the Mexican Kings. They had but to sanction the election . . . .")

[66] Zurita (p. 67). Herrera (Dec. III, lib. IV, cap. XV, p. 133). Torquemada (Lib. XIV, cap. VIII, pp. 546 and 547).

[67] Herrera (Dec. III, lib. IV, cap. XV, p. 133).

[68] Torquemada (Lib. II. cap. LVII. p. 175; cap. XXXIX. p. 144; lib. XIV, cap. VIII, pp. 546, 547 and 548). Zurita ("Rapport," p. 12). Ixtlilxochitl (Cap. XXXII, pp. 219 and 220). Veytia (Lib. III, cap. III, pp. 164 and 165). Bustamante ("Tezcoco, etc.," Parte II, cap. III, pp. 163 and 165). Clavigero (Lib. IV, cap. III).

15:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

423 posing the tribe; but the idea of sale, barter, or conveyance or alienation of such by the kin had not been conceived.

3. Individuals, whatever might be their position or office, without any exception, held but the right to use certain defined lots for their sustenance, which right, although hereditary in the male line, was nevertheless limited to the conditions of residence within the area held by the kin, and of cultivation either by or in the name of him to whom the said lots were assigned.

4. No possessory rights to land were attached to any office or chieftaincy. As members of a kin, each chief had the use of a certain lot, which he could rent or farm to others, for his benefit.

5. For the requirements of tribal business, and of the governmental features of the kinships (public hospitality included), certain tracts were set apart as official lands, out of which the official households were supplied and sustained; but these lands and their products were totally independent from the persons or families of the chiefs themselves.

648 6. Conquest of any tribe by the Mexicans was not followed by
651 an annexation of that tribe's territory, nor by an apportionment of its soil among the conquerors. Tribute was exacted, and, for the purpose of raising that tribute (in part), special tracts were set off; the crops of which were gathered for the storehouses of Mexico.

631 7. Consequently, as our previous investigation (of the warlike
642 institutions and customs of the ancient Mexicans) have disproved the generally received notion of a military despotism prevailing among them,—so the results of this review of Tenure and distribution of lands tend to establish: "that the principle and institution of feudality did not exist in aboriginal Mexico."

16:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

of progress in Institutions can be assigned to the remarkable tribe which has become so prominent in history. In other words, our object is to reconstruct the mode of government of the ancient Mexicans, the nature of its offices and dignities, and especially the principles ruling and guiding their social agglomeration.

The distinguished Mexican scholar, Manuel Orozco y Berra, explains, as well as qualifies, the condition of the aborigines of Mexico in the following manner:

"If, from the boundary-lines of the empire [of Mexico, according to his views] we now turn to the races peopling its area, we find it to be a truth undeniable that no common nor mutual tie connected these numerous and diverse tribes. Each one was independent under its chiefs.[4]"

[4] "*Geografía de las Lenguas y Carta Etnográfica de México*," por *Manuel Orozco y Berra*, Mexico, 1864, (Tercera Parte, IX México, p. 252). "Si de las demarcaciones del imperio pasamos á considerar las razas que lo poblaban, encontraremos como una verdad innegable que tanta tribu diversa no tenia un lazo comun de union. Cada una era independiente bajo el mando de sus señores. Las ambiciones particulares encendian la guerra, y la misma familia se fraccionaba. A su semejanza, cada pueblo tenia un gefe que de nombre reconocia al señor principal, y todas las provincias estaban subdividas hasta formar un sistema bajo algunos puntos semejante al feudal. Rencores y odios apartaban las tribus, y la guerra era constante, porque siendo una de sus principales virtudes la valentia, no podian verse sin combatirse. A imitacion de los orgullosos animales que sirven de diversion en los palenques. Por instinto ó porque las generaciones son arrastradas aun á su pesar por la corriente de los tiempos, los Mexicanos emprendieron la tarea de reunir en un solo haz todos aquellos pueblos, de formar de ellos una nacion, y de asimilar sus intereses con los intereses del imperio. Para llevar á cabo semejante tarea era preciso, la fuerza para poder triunfar; un sistema proseguido con tino, y con tenacidad, y el tiempo bastante para que el odio se borrara y dejara nacer las simpatías. Pero la unidad que solicitaban los Mexicanos llevaba á las tribus al mas espantoso de los despotismos; el imperio era muy nuevo para haber alcanzado otra cosa que reducir á la servidumbre, sin poder contar con el amor de sus vasallos; de manera que en lugar de amigos, tenia enemigos solapados, y su grandeza era solo engañosa appariencia. En esta sazon se presentaron los conquistadores españoles. Cualquiera fuerza extraña habia de hacer vacilar al coloso; las tribus, mal halladas con la servidumbre, vieron en los invasores á quienes podrán salvarles del yugo; en su juicio rencoroso no quisieron advertir, que por alcanzar una estéril venganza aventuraban su propia existencia, y corrieron de tropel á colocarse bajo las banderas de los estranjeros." It may be interesting to compare this weighty authority with my remarks on the same subject in "*Art of War*," (pp. 100, also note 17), and "*Tenure of Lands*," (pp. 416, 417, and 418, and annotations.) The difference consists in that Sr. Orozco y Berra ascribes to the ancient Mexicans a decided tendency to "nationalize," so to say, the aboriginal people of their conquered area, to force uniformity of customs and organization upon them, and establish a true despotism. To this I beg leave to suggest in reply:—

(1). That the Mexicans, *alone*, formed only a *part* (two-fifths in amount of tribute) of that power which is commonly termed "an Empire" (El Imperio) and which was but the Nahuatl confederacy of the Mexican valley. In evidence of it I will take the liberty to quote his own words, (same part and chapter, pp. 240, 241): "El reino de Acolhuacan era el segundo en poderio; su capital era Tetzcoco, á la orilla del lago de su nombre. Pequeña hoy y sin material interes, en lo antiguo fué rival de México y

16:Bandelier E-4 (no date) 1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

● 631 This eliminates at once the notion of a Mexican state or empire,
648 embracing in the folds of political society [5] all the groups of abor-

la segunda poblacion de las del Valle." Farther on, quoting *Juan Bautista Pomar*, "*Relacion de la ciudad de Tezcuco*," (MSS., belonging to Sr. Icazbalceta, and dated 1582) who says of Tezcuco: "La extension del reino era desde el mar del N. á la del Sur, con todo lo que se comprende á la banda del Poniente hasta el puerto de la Vera Cruz, salvo la Ciudad de Tlachcala y Huexotzinco," the learned ethnographer adds. (p. 242), "Juan B. Pomar fija las límites del reino con toda la exaggeracion que puede infundir el orgullo de raza. Por nuestra parte, hemos leido con cuidado las relaciones que á la monarquía corresponden, y hemos estudiado en el plano los lugares á que se refieren, y ni de las unas ni de las otras llegamos á sacar jamas que los reyes de Acolhuacan mandaron sobre las tribus avecindadas en la costa del Pacífico, no ya á la misma de México, sino aun á menores latitudes." He then enters upon a discussion of the number and names of settlements which gave tribute exclusively to Tezcuco. We can only refer to it in general here, as one of the most valuable contributions to Mexican history, and based upon authorities which ought to be published as soon as possible, some of which we mention for the benefit of students:—

[114] (1). "*Memorial dirigido al rey por Don Hernando Pimentel Nezcaruakcuyutl, cacique y gobernador de la provincia de Tezcuco, etc.*" This is the celebrated Report used by Torquemada and Fernando de Alba Ixtlilxochitl, and which the Cavaliere Boturini Benaducci owned.

(2). "*Relacion de Sinpuhuala del corregidor Luis Obregon*," 1580, MSS.

(3). "*Relacion de Epazoyuca por el corregidor Luis Obregon*," 1580, MSS.

(4). "*Relacion de Tetlixtaca por el corregidor Luis Obregon*," 1580, MSS.

(5). "*Relacion de Mextitlan por el alcalde mayor Gabriel de Chavez*," 1580, MSS.

(6). "*Relacion de Atengo por el corregidor Juan de Padilla*," 1579, MSS.

(7). "*Relacion de Atlatlauca por el corregidor Gaspar de Solis*," 1580, MSS.

(8). "*Relacion de Acapixtla por el alcalde mayor Juan Gutierrez de Lievana*," 1580, MSS.

(9). "*Relacion de Culhuacan por el corregidor Gonzalo Gallego*," 1580, MSS.

(10). "*Relacion de Iztapalapa por el corregidor Gonzalo Gallego*." 1580, MSS.

Since most of these valuable MSS. are the property of Sr. J. G. Icazbalceta, an early publication thereof may be hoped for.

Sr. Orozco y Berra now reaches the important conclusion:

(a). That Acolhuacan or Tezcuco had settlements tributary to it alone, (p. 246).

(b). That the "Empire" had tributaries of itself.

(c). That certain pueblos paid tribute both to Tezcuco and to Mexico, (p. 246), Epazoyuca, "pertenecieron tambien á Tetzcoco, y en el reinado de Itzcoatl quedaron por mitad para México y para Tetzcoco, á fin de que de allí sacaran los imperiales las navajas para sus macanas." Taken probably from Relacion 3.

The "Imperiales" were, therefore, the confederates, and the "Imperio" the confederacy. But if, within the area conquered by these confederates, each one of them received its share of tributary tribes, how could it be their task or tendency to unify or nationalize, since each of the three associates composed but a part of that power, and their association was a voluntary one?

(2). None of the confederates exercised any power over the others, beyond the exclusively military direction delegated to the Mexicans proper. "*Rapport sur les différentes classes de chefs de la Nouvelle Espagne, Par Alonso de Zurita*," translated from the Spanish original by Mr. Ternaux Compans, and printed in 1840, by him in his "*Voyages Relations et Mémoires originaux pour servir à l' histoire de la découverte de l' Amérique*," (p. 11). "La province de Mexico était soumise á trois principaux chefs: celui de Mexico, celui de Tezcuco et celui de Tlacopan, que l'on nomme aujourd' hui Tacuba. Tous les chefs inférieurs relevaient de ces souverains et leur obéissaient. Les trois chefs supérieurs formaient une confédération et se partageaient les provinces dont ils s'emparaient. Le souverain de Mexico avait au dessous de lui ceux de Tezcuco et de Tacuba pour les affaires qui avaient rapport á la guerre; quant á toutes les autres, leurs puissances étaient égales, de sorte que l' un d' eux ne se mêlait jamais du

16:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

igines settled within the area tributary to the valley-tribes. Consequently we need not look beyond the tribe, for any *larger group*

gouvernament des autres," (p. 16). "Chaque souverain confirmait l' election de ses vassaux, car, ainsi qu' on l' a déjà dit, leur juriedliction était indépendante pour les affaires civiles et criminelles."

Fray Toribio de Motolinia. "*Historia de los Indios de Nueva España,*" in Vol. I, of Sr. Icazbalceta's "Coleccion de Documentos, etc." (Epistola proemial, p. 5). "Despues el señorio de Tetzcoco fué tan grande como el de México." (Id. p. 11) "Los de Tetzcoco, que en antigüedad y señorio no son menos que los Mexicanos." (Tratado III, Cap. VII, p. 182) "Esta ciudad de Tetzcoco era la segunda cosa principal de la tierra, y asimismo el señor de ella era el segundo señor de la tierra; sujetaba debajo de si quince provincias hasta la provincia de Tuzapan, que está á la costa del Mar del Norte. . . . . á la parte de Oriente tiene México Tenuchtitlan á una legua la ciudad ó pueblo de Tlacopan, adonde residia el tercero señor de la tierra, al cual estaban sujetas diez provincias: estos dos señores ya dichos se podrian bien llamar reyes, porque no les faltaba nada para lo ser. (p. 183) "Las de las provincias y principales pueblos eran como señores de ditado ó salva, y sobre todos eran los mas principales los dos, el de Tetzcoco y el de Tlacopan; y estos con todos los otros todo lo mas del tiempo residian en México, y tenian corte á Moteuczoma." We know, however, that the fact of *residence* of the head-war-chiefs of Tezcuco and Tlacopan at Mexico, is not true, though their frequent visits there on military business, and their protracted stay after the Spaniards had entered the pueblo, may explain the error. The latter passage is amended by the good father (Trat. III, cap. VIII. p. 187), as follows: "y si de esto algun señor tenia exencion era el de Tetzcoco."

Fernando Cortés, Carta Segunda, (In *Vedia's* "*Historiadores primitivos, etc.*" Vol. I, p. 29). Speaking of Cacamatzin, he says: "é segun lo que despues dél supe, era él muy cercano deudo de Muteczuma, y tenia su señorio junto al del dicho Muteczuma; cuyo nombre era Haculnacan." Cortés further relates that when Cacamatzin threatened to take up arms, he requested Montezuma to direct him to come to Mexico, but the chieftain of Tezcuco refused, saying, "that if they wanted something of him, they might come over on his land, where they would find out who he was, and what kind of obedience he was held to." Montezuma even was afraid, upon this reply, to suggest open violence, dissuading Cortés from it altogether. This shows clearly that the Mexicans had no authority over the Tezcucans, and even were loth to assail them.

Francisco Lopez de Gomara. Conquista de Méjico (In Vedia. Tom. I, p. 346). "Habia asimesmo otros muchos señores y reyes, como los de Tezcuco y Tlacopan, que no le debian nada, sino la obediencia y homenaje." Also, on the treacherous seizure of Cacamatzin, he confirms Cortés (p. 353), "La prision de Cacama, rey de Tezcuco." (Id. p. 435), "a Chimapopoca sucedió el otra su hermano, dicho Izcoua. Este Izcoua señorio á Axcapuzalco, Cuauhnau, Chalco, Coustlichan y Huexocinco, mas tuvo por acompañados en el gobierno á Nezaualcoyocin, señor de Tezcuco, y al señor de Tlacopan, y de aqui adelante mandaron y gobernaron estos tres señores cuantos reinos y pueblos obedecian y tributaban á los de Culúa; bien que el principal y el mayor dellos era el rey de Méjico, el segundo el de Tezcuco, y el menor el de Tlacopan."

Bernal Diaz de Castillo. Historia verdadera de la Conquista de Nueva-España. (Vedia, Vol. II, Cap. C. p. 100.) "Como el Cacamatzin, señor de la ciudad de Tezcuco que despues de Méjico era la mayor y mas principal ciudad que hay en la Nueva España." Also on the seizure of Cacamatzin, confirmatory of Cortés and of Gomara (pp. 101 and 103).

Gonzalo Fernandez de Oviedo y Valdés. Historia natural y general de Indias. Madrid. 1833 (Lib. XXXIII, cap. VIII, pp. 294 and 296). The entire chapter is devoted to the seizure of Cacamatzin, and is almost a verbal copy of the report made by Cortés, (Lib. XXXIII, cap. LII, p. 539). It contains a letter written to Oviedo, by the vice-roy of Mexico, Don Antonio de Mendoza, under date of 6 October, 1541, in which this functionary says: "Y lo de aqui no es tan poco que no podays hacer libro dello, é no será pequeño; porque aunque Montequma é México es lo que entre nosotros ha sonado,

16:Bandelier E-4 (no date) 1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

631 of social organization. The confederacy of tribes, as we have
648 already shown, carried no influence whatever on the organization.

no era menor señor el Caconci de Mechuacan, y otros que reconoscian al uno ni al otro." We quote this passage merely as a general illustration.

Fray Bernardino de Sahagun. Historia general de las Cosas de Nueva-España, published by Sr. C. M. de Bustamante, in 1829 (Vol. II. lib. VIII. cap. III. p. 276). "El cuarto señor de Tezcoco se llamó Netzahoalcoiotzin, y reinó ochenta y un años, y en tiempo de este se comenzaron las guerras, y tuvo el señorio de Tezcoco siendo señor del de México Itzcoatzin, y estos entrambos hicieron guerra á los de Tecpaneca, de Atzcaptzalco, y á otros pueblos y provincias, y el fué fundador del señorio de Tezcoco in Acolhuacan." (Id. Vol. III. lib. XII. cap. XLI, page 89, close of chapter.)

Fray Diego Durán. Historia de las Yndias de Nueva España é Islas de Tierra Firme. Published by Sr. José Fernandez Ramirez at Mexico, in 1867, (Cap. XIV, p. 123). "El rey Itzcoatl, aunque mal dispuesto, holgó de la victoria y dió las gracias á todos los señores y principales, al qual, agravándosele la enfermedad, entendiendo de se acertarsele la muerte, mandó llamar al Señor de Tezcuco, Nequalcoyotl, pariente cercano suyo, y acouejóle que no tuviese guerra con los Mexicanos, sus parientes y amigos, sino que antes se hiciese con ellos y fuese en su favor siempre: y dexó ordenallo que desde en adelante fuese de Tezcuco el segundo rey de la comarca y el tercero el de Tacuba, á quien llamauan el rey de Tlaluacpan. . . ." (p. 124). ". . . y solo estos tres reynos mandaron y governaron la tierra, de hoy en adelante, siendo el de México sobre todos ellos, y casi como emperador y monarca del nuevo mundo." Nearly the whole of Cap. XV is devoted to the formation of the confederacy, but cannot be inserted here. The editor, Sr. J. F. Ramirez, appears to incline to the opinion, however, that there was a confederacy on equal terms, (note 2, p. 130). The same author also-
[796] states repeatedly that the head-chiefs of Tezcuco and Tlacopan sacrificed (slaughtered) captives at the chief teo-calli of Mexico, on very solemn occasions, together with the head-chief of Mexico, thus showing equal rights. (Cap. XXIII, p. 197 and others.) But his plainest statement is found (Cap. XLIII, p. 347), and reads as follows: "Algunos han querido decir quel reyno de Tezcuco era libre de todo reconocimiento y parias al monarca, y que en nada le era sujeto, lo qual allo al contrario en esta ystoria Mexicana; porque aunque á la verdad no tributauan á Mexico mantas ni joias ni plumas ni cosas de comida, como otras provincias tributauan, hallo empero á los Mexicanos metidos en las tierras tezcucanas donde sembraban y cogian, y algunos dellos hechos terrazgueros de los señores de México; y allo que en ofreciéndose estas fiestas y solenidades, daban tributo desclanos para ella, de lo qual ninguno estaua esento ni reservado. Tambien allo que ofreciéndose dar guerra á alguna ciudad y provincia, al primero que llamauan y acudian para que apercibiese sus gentes, era al rey de Tezcuco, y como abemos, notado en esta ystoria, le hacian venir á Mexico todas las veces que se ofrecia ocasion, loqual no era poca sujecion, dado que tuviese sus préeminencias y libertades de rey y señor de aquella provincia de Acolhuacan; . . . ."

Fernando de Alvarado Tezozomoc. Crónica Mexicana. (8th Vol. of Lord Kingsborough's "Antiquities of Mexico.") This author agrees so closely with Durán in most instances, that we can dispense with full quotations. See Cap. XIX and XX. on the pretended conquest of Tezcuco by the Mexicans. Tezozomoc is very positive on the question of joint sacrifice (Cap. LXIX. p. 117). A singular remark is, however, found (Cap. XCVII. p. 173). After the Huexotzincas had sent delegates to Mexico to sue for
[725] peace, the Mexican council was called together: "dijo itlhuacatl resolvio: Señor, como será esto, si no lo saben vuestros consegeros de guerra los reyes de Acolhuacan-Nezahualpilli, y el de Tecpanecas Tlaltecatzin? hagase entero cabildo y acuerdo: fue acordado asi." This important incident shows that not even the Mexicans had the right to treat alone with a power hostile to the three tribes, consequently that the other two were their *confederates*, and *not their feudal vassals*. Fray Durán confirms the incident in chapter LX, p. 473, of his work, proceedingly quoted.

Joseph de Acosta, Historia natural y moral de las Indias, Madrid, 1608, derives his information from the same source as the two preceding, namely: the Codex Ramí

16:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

it was only a partnership, formed for the purpose of carrying on 631
the business of warfare, and that intended not for the extension of 648

res, now in process of publication at Mexico. Acosta mentions and describes (Lib. VII, Cap. XV, p. 490), the traditionary war between the Mexicans and Texcucans concluding: "Con esto quedó el Rey de Mexico por supremo Rey de Tezcuco, y no quitandoles su Rey, sino haziendole del supremo Consejo suyo." (Cap. XVI, p. 490.) Both chiefs, of Tezcuco and of Tlacopan, are mentioned by him as "electors" of the Mexican head-chiefs.

Sebastian Ramirez de Fuenleal, Bishop of San Domingo and President of the Royal Audiencia at Mexico. "*Lettre . . . à sa majesté Charles V*," translated by Mr. Ternaux-Compans in his "Premier Recueil de Pièces relatives à la Nouvelle-Espagne," and bearing date 3 Nov., 1532 (p. 234). "Les souverains de Texcoco, de Tacuba, qui étaient très puissants dans cette contrée, agissaient de même que Mutizuma. Ils partageaient entre eux et ce souverain le fruit de leurs conquêtes; cependant les souverains de Mexico étaient les plus puissants, et ils eurent toujours une plus grande différence." The same words about are repeated in the "*Second Recueil*," printed 1840, (the first "Recueil" appeared in 1838), on p. 223. The Report is therein stated to be by the President *and* the Audiencia.

"*Lettre des Chapelains Frère Toribio et Frère Diego D'Olarte à Don Luis de Velasco* etc.," date: 86. François de Cholula, 27 Août, 1554. (Ternaux, "Recueil." 1, p. 403), "Toutes les autres obéissaient à Montezuma, au souverain de Texcuco, et à celui de Tlacopa. Ces trois princes étaient étroitement confédérés; ils partageaient entre eux tous les pays qu'ils subjuguaient. Montezuma exerçait la toute-puissance dans les affaires relatives à la guerre et au gouvernement de la confédération."

Fray Gerónimo de Mendieta. "*Historia ecclesiastica Indiana*," published by Icazbalceta in 1870. After having mentioned (Lib. II, cap. XXVI, p. 129) that the chiefs of Mexico and Tezcuco sent challenges to foreign tribes to recognize "the chief of Mexico" as their superior, and to give him tribute, he says (Cap. XXVIII, p. 134), "Es de saber que los señores de México, Tezcuco y Tacuba, como reyes y señores supremos de esta tierra. . . . ." (Cap. XXXVII, p. 186.) "Los señores de las provincias ó pueblos que inmediatamente eran subjetos á Mexico, iban luego allí á ser confirmados en sus señorias, despues que los principales de sus provincias los habian elegido, y con algunos. . . . . En los pueblos y provincias que inmediatamente eran subjetos á Tezcuco y á Tacuba tenian recurso por la confirmacion á sus señores; que en esto y otras cosas estos dos señores no reconocian superior." Italics are my own.

Antonio de Herrera. "*Historia general de los hechos de los Castellanos en las Islas y la Tierra-Firme del mar Oceano*." 1726, Madrid. (Dec. II, lib. VII, cap. XII, p. 190). He almost copies Gomara, and in regard to the seizure of Cacamatzin he not only confirms Cortés, Gomara, and Bernal Diez, but is much more detailed and positive yet. (Dec. II, lib. IX, cap. II, pp. 217, 218.) Finally he asserts: (Dec. III, lib. IV, cap. XV. p. 133), "Con Mexico estaban confederados los Señores de Tezcuco, i Tlacopan, que aora llaman Tacuba, i partian lo que ganaban; i obedecian al Señor de Mexico, en lo tocante á la guerra, i tenian algunos Pueblos comunes en sucesion, asi de los Señorios, como de los Mayorazgos, i haciendas."

We now turn to an author who plainly takes an opposite view of the question, claiming, in place of a *Mexican* "Empire," the supremacy for the *Texcucans*, or an ancient "Empire" of the Chichimecas. The latter claim has already been discussed in "*Tenure of Lands*" (p. 304, note 10). This assumption,—which strongly combats the view that there was anything at all like an Empire, while it implies the existence of a more confederacy,—is set forth by the following well known Texcucan native author.

Fernando de Alba Ixtlilxochitl. "*Histoire des Chichimèques ou des anciens Rois de Texcuco*." This is the french translation of the original "Historia de los Chichimecas, etc., etc.," contained in Lord Kingsborough's 9th volume. Since abstracts might prove too lengthy, I merely refer to (Cap. XXXII), on the formation of the confederacy as containing some very plain and remarkable passages (pp. 216, 219, and 220), among

16:Bandelier E-4 (no date) 1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

631 territorial ownership, but only for an increase of the means of sub-
648 sistence.[6]

which is one: "ces trois dynasties gouvernaient la Nouvelle-Espagne jusqu'à l'arrivée des chrétiens. Cependant, quoiqu'elles fussent égales en rang, en puissance et en revenu il y avait de certains tributs dont le roi de Tlacopan ne recevait qu'un cinquième, tandis que ceux de Mexico et de Tezcuco en recevaient chacun deux." See also (Cap. XXXIV, cap. XXXVI, pp. 243 and 246; cap. XXXVIII, pp. 269 and 273; 2d vol., Cap. LXXI, pp. 109 and 110), and others. Nevertheless, Ixtlilxochitl reproaches bitterly Montezuma with having usurped the leading power which belonged to the Texcucans (according to him), and having taken the direction of the confederacy into his hands. (Cap. LXXV, p. 128, to XXVI, p. 132, etc.). These charges are violently repeated in his other and more extensive work: "*Relaciones historicas.*" Also in Vol. IX of Lord Kingsborough. As a specimen, I refer to the 'Venida de los Españoles" translated also by Mr. Ternaux under the title of "*Cruautés horribles des conquérants du Mexique.*" In regard to the war between Tezcuco and Mexico, in which he, of course, attributes the fullest victory to the former see also "*Undécima Relacion*" (Kingsborough, IX, pp. 407 and 408). Ixtlilxochitl is seconded and followed by his illustrious contemporary. *Fray Juan de Torquemada.* "*Los veintiun Libros Rituales i monarchia Indiana,* etc., etc.' Edition of 1723. This distinguished ecclesiastic is such a consistent advocate of feudalism, that he even assigns the division of Tenochtitlan into four quarters to an "edict" of the "Chichimecan Emperor" Techotlalatzin (Lib. II, cap. VIII, pp. 88 and 89), or to an order of Mexican "Lords" (Lib. III, cap. XXIV, p. 295). Still he is very plain about Tezcuco being equal and not subject to Mexico. Compare for instance (Lib. III, cap. XXVII, p. 304), "nunca perdió su antigua estimacion, y siempre tuvo Rey, y Señor legitimo, que la regia, y governaba, y era igual con el de Mexico," (Lib. II, cap. XXXIX, p. 144), about the confederacy; (Cap. XI, p. 146). About the pretended war between the two tribes (Cap. XLII, p. 149. "Y no solo no es verdad; pero es directamente contra ella." On the supposed intrigues of Montezuma against the Texcucans (Lib. II, caps. LXXXIII, LXXXIV, etc., etc.), until the first passage of Cap. LXXXVII, (p. 217), "muerto el Rei Nezahualpilli de Tetzcuco, y entrando en su lugar su Hijo Cacama . . . . corrió la confederacion de los Reies, como hasta entonces lo avian acostumbrado . . . ." also (Lib. XI, cap. XXVI, p. 353), " . . . . no deja de ser su igual, y semejante el de Tetzcuco . . . . ." (Cap. XXVII, p. 356; cap. XXVIII, p. 361.) Copy of Mendieta. About warfare of the Confederates (Lib. XII, cap. VI, p. 388; Lib. XIV, cap. I, p. 455; Cap. II, p. 457). Division of Spoils and of Tributes Idem. (cap. VIII, pp. 546, 547 and 548), "porque cierto es asi, que el Rei de Mexico no era mayor en Autoridad, que el de Tetzcuco . . . . ." From these, but especially from Torquemada's history of the conquest, which occupies the entire fourth Book (Vol. I), enough can be gathered to show that this cumbrous but important authority admits no Mexican Empire, but only a confederacy of Mexicans, Texcucans, and Tlacopans.

Fray Agustin de Vetancurt, "*Teatro Mexicano,*" (Edition of 1870), admits the supremacy of the Mexicans (Parte IIa, Trat. 1°, cap. XIV, p. 291), "y remataron la fiesta que dando Izcohuatl por rey supremo del imperio tepaneca, por ser primero que nezahualcoyotl, y este por rey de los acolhuas, y al de Tacuba le hicieron rey de la parte de mazahuacan, etc. . . . . ". But the confederacy "liga," of the three chiefs is acknowledged everywhere. (Also Trat. II°, cap. III, p. 292), "cuando los Mexicanos, los Texcocanos ó de Tlacopan (que eran los reyes que estaban confederados para las guerras, etc. . . ."

To this lengthy collection of quotations many others might be added, from the same period as well as of a later date. They appear to justify the proposition advanced, namely: none of the confederates exercised any power over the others, beyond that of *exclusively military* leadership, which had been awarded to the Mexicans proper.

The conquerors never interfered with the government, organization, and mode of life of tribes whom they had overpowered. No attempt, either direct or implied, was made to assimilate or incorporate them.

My *friend Dr. C. Brühl,* author of the highly interesting and conscientious work

16:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

Our investigations are therefore confined to the limits of the single tribe, and we have selected for that purpose the Mexicans 128

"*Die Culturvoelker des alten Amerika*" (Cincinnati, 1876, '77, '78), has, in regard to the statements made in "*Art of War*" (p. 100, note 17; p. 133, note 139), and in "*Tenure of Lands*" (pp. 412 and 413, also note 56; pp. 417 and 418, also note 69), called my attention to a passage from *Sahagun*, "*Historia general*" (Lib. VIII, cap. XXIV, p. 313), "Habiendo pacificado la provincia, luego los señores del campo repartian tributos á los que habian sido conquistados, para que cada un año los diesen al señor que les habia conquistado, y el tributo era de lo que en ella se criaba y se hacia, y luego elegian gobernadores y oficiales que presidiesen en aquella provincia, no de los naturales de ella, sino de los que la habian conquistado." The author himself, however, gives the explanation of what he intends to designate by such "governors and officials who should preside in said province." In his 12th Book, (Cap. II, p. 5, Vol. III), he says: "La primera vez que parecieron navios en la costa de esta Nueva-España, los capitanes de Moctheuzoma que se llamaban *Calpixques* que estaban cerca de la costa luego fueron á ver que era aquello que vino, que nunca habian visto navios, uno de los cuales fue el calpixque de Cuextecatl que se llamaba Pinotl: llevaba consigo otros calpixques uno que se llamaba Yaotzin, que residia en el pueblo de Mictlanquauhtla, y otro que se llamaba Teozinzocatl, que residia en el pueblo de Teociniocan, y otro que se llamaba Cuitlalpitoc, este no era calpixque sino criado de uno de estos calpixques, y principalejo que se llamaba Tentlil." In this Sahagun about agrees with *Tezozomoc* (*Crónica*, Cap. CVI, CVII, CVIII, CIX), inasmuch as the latter also states the officers to have been calpixques, th. is, "Stewards" or *gatherers of tribute*. Compare *Alonzo de Molina*, "*Vocabulario*," (Parte IIa, p. 12.) 631 648

The names of these Indians who received Cortés are found nearly alike in all the authors, but we are struck by the fact that many of them call the natives "governors" of Montezuma. I quote *Bernal Diez de Castillo* (Cap. XXXVIII, pp. 32 and 33, Vedia, Vol. II) *Gomara* (pp. 312, 313, 314, etc., Vedia 1). *Ixtlilxochitl* ("*Histoire des Chichimèques*," Cap. LXXIX, p. 100). "*Cruautés horribles*," (p. 3.) *Herrera* (Dec. II, lib. V, cap. IV, p. 116; Cap. V, p. 117). *Torquemada* (Lib. IV, cap. XVI, p. 287; Cap. XVII, p. 289, etc.). *Velancurt* (Vol. II, cap. IV, p. 43). *Fray Joseph Joaquin Granados y Galvez*, ("*Tardes Americanas*" Mexico, 1778, 9th evening, p. 234). *Abbate F. X. Clavigero* ("*Geschichte von Mexico*," Leipzig, 1790, a german translation of the Italian original which appeared at Cesena in 1780. Vol. II, Lib. VIII, cap. V, p. 16). These *governors* therefore were but "calpixques," in other words *collectors of tribute*. This is already stated by *Oviedo y Valdés* (Vol. III, Lib. XXXIII, cap. 1, p. 259), speaking of Cempoal, "porque los indios è ministros, que alli estaban para mandarlos, eran oficiales è mayordomos de la cibdad de México." The "*Real Ejecutoria de S. M., Sobre Tierras y Reservas de Pechos y Paga pertenecientè á los Caciques de Azapuzco, de la Jurisdiccion de Otumba*," (Col. de Doc's, Vol. II, Icazbalceta, p. 5), calls all the Indians in question "enviados por el gran Montezuma."

This explains the evident contradictions of Sahagun.

It is a singular fact, but one amply proven by the records of the conquest, that nowhere did the Spaniards, on their whole march from the coast to Mexico, meet with Mexican *administrators* or *rulers* of subjected tribes. Quotations are useless, we only refer to the remarkable description furnished by Bernal Diez of the events at Quiahuiztlan (Vedia II, Cap. XLVI, pp. 40 and 41), which culminated in the violence done to the "recaudadores de Montezuma." This scene, which is highly characteristic, has been beautifully "remodeled," through a few omissions, by our own great *W. H. Prescott* ("*History of the conquest of Mexico*," 1860, Book II, chap. VII, p. 349). There is, finally, abundant proof of the fact that neither the Mexicans, nor any of their confederate-, ever attempted to change or subvert the organization and mode of government of any of the tribes whom they overthrew. I refer to *Oviedo y Valdés* (Lib. XXXIII, cap. XLVI, p. 303). *Torquemada* (Lib. XIV, cap. VIII, p. 547). *Ixtlilxochitl* (*Histoire des Chichimèques*, (Cap. XXXVIII, p. 274). *Andrés de Tápia* ("*Relacion sobre la Conquista* 631 636 648

16:Bandelier E-4 (no date) 1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

128 proper, who dwelt, as elsewhere established by us, on the partly artificial islands in the lagune of the Mexican valley.[7] Besides the prominence acquired by them in the annals of history, it may safely be assumed that, in a general manner, their Institutions are typical of those of other sedentary tribes.[8]

121 *Tribal* society, based according to Lewis H. Morgan upon KIN, and not *political* society which rests, according to the same author, upon TERRITORY and PROPERTY, must therefore be looked for among the ancient Mexicans. It remains for us to establish its degree of development, its details, and the manner of its working.

In order to comprehend the true nature of these questions, we should secure as much information as possible of the *past* of the tribe under consideration. Institutions are never wilfully or accidentally created, but evolved; in other words, they are the result of growth in knowledge and experience.[9] The great difference existing between tribal society and political is explained as a dif-

[63] [636] [48]

de México," Col. de Doc., Vol. II, Icazbalceta, p. 361, and especially p. 392), "México tenia en su tiempo en el hacer guerra esta órden; que yendo á la guerra, al que se daba de paz no tenia sobre él tributo cierto, sino que tantas veces en el año lo llevaban presente á su discrecion del que lo llevaba; pero si era poco mostrábales mal rostro, y si mucho agradeciaselo. Y en estos no ponia mayordomo ni recaudador ni cosa; el señor se era señor. Los que tomaba de guerra decian *tequitin tlacotl*, que quiere decir, tributan como esclavos. En estos ponia mayordomos y recogedores y recaudadores; y aunque los Señores mandaban su gente, eran debajo de la mano destos de México . . . . ." *Motolinia* (Trat. III, cap. VII, p. 185), *Granados y Galvez*. (5th night, p. 168), a singular picture of purest feudality, for which Gomara may be responsible in part. *Ramirez de Fuenlal* (*Letter of 4th Nov.*, 1532, 1st; "*Recueil*," (pp. 245, 246, and 247). *Zurita* "*Rapport*," (p. 16), to be compared with Mendieta and Torquemada.

Consequently there was no tendency towards unification or nationalization in all the successful and extensive raids which the Nahuatlaca of the valley of Mexico carried on for a full century. No organic body, larger than the tribe, resulted from these sanguinary forays; because the confederacy itself was not the end, but the beginning of these undertakings. This justifies the view which I shall hereafter advocate in regard to the nature of that confederacy namely: as a mere partnership to carry on the business of warfare the latter in turn being part of the mode of subsistence.

[7] "Based upon territory and property" according to L. H. Morgan, in contra-distinction to tribal-society, based upon "Kin." ("*Ancient Society*," chapter II, page 62).

[8] "*Art of War*," p. 96.

[9] "*Art of War*," p. 150. "*Tenure of Lands*," pp. 421, 422.

[10] "*Iztlilxochitl* (*Histoire des Chichimèques*," Cap. XXXVI, p. 343). "Ainsi, tout ce qui se dit de Texcuco doit s'entendre aussi des deux autres, ..." *Gomara* (p. 440, Vedia, I). "To speak of the Mexicans, signifies as much as speaking of all New Spain." The title of the section is: "Costumbres de los hombres," and the original text reads: "Hablando de méjicanos, es hablar en general de toda la Nueva-España." Although *Zurita* (p. 5) insists upon the variety of customs among the aborigines,—changing from settlement to settlement, from tribe to tribe,—his own report furnishes the proof of the contrary, and it is evident from the text that he alludes principally to the diversity in languages and dialects.

[11] *Morgan* ("*Ancient Society*," Chap. I, p. 6).

16:Bandelier E-4 (no date) 1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

174 643 646 was the particular "calpulli" of Mexico who furnished the Mexican head-war-chiefs down to 1520 A. D.

174 643 Analogous to the New Mexican pueblo, the tribe of Mexico had, from that time on, its supreme council and finally two executive head-chiefs; for with the creation of the military office of "chief of men," the "Snake-woman" rose correspondingly in importance.[52] No change in that organization took place until the Spanish conquest although within the period of nearly one hundred and fifty years (approximately) thus indicated, we find, at three distinct epochs, mention of virtual changes or subversions of the aboriginal institutions of the Mexican tribe.

174 631 The first one of these critical dates agrees with the third decade of the fifteenth century, or the time when, through a well executed dash, the Mexicans overthrew the power of the Tecpanecas on the mainland.

This successful move, perhaps originally conceived in self-defence, finally brought about the confederacy of the "nahuatl" tribes of Mexico, Tezcuco, and of Tlacopan. We have nothing to add to our first picture of this military partnership, as drawn in "Tenure of Lands."[53] Still the event deserves special men-

day they elected the brother, to-morrow they elected the "grandson, and the day after the nephew, and thus they went through the whole lineage without any end" This is a plain description of the succession of office in the kin. Torquemada is about equally explicit, and this agreement between two authors who represent antagonistic tribal traditions, is certainly of great weight. To this should be added the statement of *Sahagun* (Vol. II, p. 318), "and (they) selected one of the most noble ones of the lineage ("linea") of the lords post." Even the series of contradictions of *Zurita* ("*Rapport*, etc.," pp. 19-20), contain a plain description (if attentively studied) of succession in the kin, and not in the family.

[52] At the time Francisco Vasquez de Coronado reached and conquered New Mexico, its sedentary Indians were governed by a council of old men, and besides they had governors and captains. This is explicitly stated by *Pedro de Castañeda y Nagera*, ("*Relation du Voyage de Cibola, entrepris en* 1540,") who went with Coronado in 1540, in the French translation by Mr. Ternaux-Compans, 1838 (Cap. XI, p. 61), about Tuscayan Cibola, although flatly contradicted again by himself (Part. II. cap. III. p. 164), in regard to Cibola. *Torquemada* (Lib. IV, cap. XL. p. 661), mentions the "mandon" (commander) and after him what he calls a "crier" "y despues de el, es el que pregona, y avisa las cosas, que son de Republica, y que se han de hacer en el Pueblo." The same author is also very explicit (Lib. XI, cap. XVII, p. 837), when he distinctly states: "El Governo de los del Nuevo-Mexico parece de Senado, ó de Señoria," mentioning also the two other officers.

For the actually prevailing governmental system of the New-Mexican Pueblos the sources are very numerous. I simply refer to *H. H. Bancroft* (Vol. I, pp. 546 and 547), *W. W. H. Davis* ("*The Spanish Conquest of New-Mexico*," 1869, p. 415, note 4), *Oscar Loew* ("*Lieutenant G. M. Wheeler's Pueblo Expedition* [with *New Mexico* and *Colorado*, 1874," in Petermann's "*Geographische Mittheilungen*," Vol. 22, p. 213). All the other main sources it would be useless to enumerate.

[53] Pp. 416, 417, and 418, and notes 61 to 70 inclusive. Also note 4 of this paper. In re-

16:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

tion here, because of its unveiling, so to say, the full organization of the ancient Mexicans as they preserved it until the time of their downfall.

Upon the occasion of the division of spoils gathered from the defeated Tecpanecas, and of the establishment of regular tribute, there appear the following war captains and leaders of the Mexicans, as representatives of the latter's organization.

The "chief of men."

Four captains of the four principal quarters of Mexico.

Twenty war-chiefs of as many kins composing the tribe.

One chief representing the element of worship, or "medicine."

The "Snake-woman."[54]

gard to the date of its occurrence, *Bancroft* (Vol. V, p. 336), says about, or immediately after, 1431, following Brasseur de Bourbourg. *Clavigero* (Lib. IV, cap. III, p. 231), 1498, *Ixtlilxochitl* ("*Hist. Chichimeca*." Cap. XXXII, p. 217), also 1431, *Veytia* (Lib. III, cap. III, p. 168) 1431, The "*Codex Telleriano-Remensis*" (Kingsb., Vol. I, p. 7, and Vol. VI, p. 138), has it 7, "Tochtli" or 1404.

[54] *Durán* (Cap. XI, p. 96). Besides distributing land "juntamente con darce y repartirce las tierras que aveis ganado, para que tengais renta para el sustento de vuestros estados y personas segun el mérito dellas," he gave them "ditados" or titles "y (quiere) hacerce señores de titulo" (the latter would be to make them noblemen). I must advert here that "ditado o titulo de honra" is expressed in the Mexican language by "tecuyotl" "tlatocaxotl" "maniçotl" (*Molina*, "*Vocabulario*," Part I, p. 46). These words however mean but, respectively "chieftainship," "speakership," and "honor," (the latter see *Molina* II, p. 84), all of them terms which, as we shall hereafter see, apply to *personal merit*, and not to hereditary privilege among the Mexican aborigines. Durán then proceeds (p. 97) to give these titles as follows:—

"Primeramente á un general dió por ditado				*Tlacochcalcatitlantli.*
A Vexo Motençuma,			Tlacaelteltzin dió por ditado	*Tlacatecatl.*
A Tlacaxspan,	d.	p.	d.	*Ezhuahuacatl.*
A Cuathecoatl,	d.	p.	d.	*Tlillancalqui.*
A Venepecan,	d.	p.	d.	*Tzonmolcatl.*
A Aztacoatl,	d.	p.	d.	*Tocuilloxcatl.*
A Canaltzin,	d.	p.	d.	*Acolnahuacatl.*
A Tzompantzin,	d.	p.	d.	*Huetzpotli.*
A Epcotlaxtzin,	d.	p.	d.	*Temilotzin.*
A Cotlaleoatzin,	d.	p.	d.	*Tzompanecatl.*
A Tlacaleo,	d.	p.	d.	*Calmimilolcatl.*
A Izcuezlatoc,	d.	p.	d.	*Mixcoltecatli.*
A Cuauhtzitzimitl,	d.	p.	d.	*Huitznahuatl.*
A Xicococ,	d.	p.	d.	y renombre, *Tzonmolcatitlantli.*
A Tlacochcotl,	d.	p.	d.	*Quetzalcoatl.*
A Axicyotzin,	d.	p.	d.	*Tzoctlamacazqui.*
A Izcuezlilloc,	d.	p.	d.	*Tlapaltecatl.*
A Mecaxtzin,	d.	p.	d.	*Cuauhquiahuacatl.*
A Tenamaztli,	d.	p.	d.	*Coatlecatl.*
A Tzoctemoc,	d.	p.	d.	*Pantecatl.*
A Tlacacochtoc,	d.	p.	d.	*Huexotzincatl.*

To these he adds (pp. 96 and 99), five more, namely: *Quauhnochtzintli, Cuauhquiacatzintli, Tepictoltzintli, Cuitlauacatl, and Itzcuinti.* The three last were from Culhuacan. Adding to this the "chief of men" himself, who was "Flint-Snake," or